

REMARKS

By the above actions, claim 14 has been further amended. In this regard, it is noted that, prior to filing of this response several proposals for amending of claim 14 were informally presented to and discussed with the Examiner. No agreements were reached as to patentability, however, the Examiner did agree that all issues of indefiniteness were resolved by the above claim. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection under with the Examiner. No agreements were reached as to patentability, however, the Examiner did agree that all issues of indefiniteness were resolved by the above claim. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection under 5 USC § 112 is now requested.

As for the rejection of claims 14-26 under 35 USC § 103 based upon the combined teachings of the Muoio et al and Takahasi patents, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is sought for the following reasons.

First, as indicated to the Examiner, because the same playlist is playing at the same time in the two rooms in accordance with Muoio's teaching, a portion of the sequence would be missed by a viewer travelling between rooms and there is no suggestion to synchronize the time at which one element of the sequence plays in one room to the time at which the sequentially next element appears in the other room. Furthermore, Takahasi teaches an information display system and method in which a velocity detector detects the velocity of a person travelling along a predetermined path "on a moving walk, an escalator or a vehicle" (col. 3, lines 37-40) and a controller controls information display programs of image servers on a series of image display devices arranged sequentially along the path in accordance with the detected velocity of the moving person. On the one hand, this concept is not intended for displays that are not along a prescribed path or for a person who is walking instead of moving on a conveyance, and on the other hand, Takahasi's control is based on detected speed, not an average travel time. Thus, Takahasi represents an entirely different concept which would not suggest the claimed invention as defined by now-amended claim 14, nor would it be obvious to apply to persons walking from room to room in a building as in Muoio.

In the Final Rejection, the Examiner interpreted the average time to be based on an average velocity (see, Final Rejection dated 11/01/2010, pg. 7, last paragraph). While one can determine travel time from average velocity, they are not the same. Furthermore, since Takahashi's screens are place along a defined path, it is a simple matter to have the images

change (move) along the path at the same velocity. In contrast, in a home, museum or other building, as is the case for Muoio, where the display is disclosed as being merely decorative (one or more series of artwork images are displayed) in a number of different rooms and no defined path exists, the use of velocity detectors would be an unnecessary expense since no message is to be conveyed to viewer as in Takahashi.

Furthermore, merely knowing the velocity at which a person is walking would be of little use in Muoio's context without knowing the room to which the person is traveling. For example, a person who is walking will not travel at the consistent speed of a person on a conveyance, in that a person will walk down a hall, climb stairs, and descend stairs all at different rates and the person in a home may have to open and close doors along the way. Using an average time acquired, e.g., empirically, can take into account all of these factors and can enable continuous viewing of a full sequenced presentation in various locations without the need for sensors; but, a velocity measurement, or sequence of velocity measurements would not result in proper sequencing until the arrival location became known and stops along the way to open and close doors would result in it becoming highly unlikely that the proper sequencing would be achieved. However, the simple fact remains that Muoio is not concerned with insuring that the complete series of artworks are viewed in any particular order so that there would be no reason to even coordinate the displays sequentially in any fashion (via velocity sensors or using average time).


Accordingly, since there is no reason to combine the teachings of Muoio and Takahashi and any combination thereof would not lead to a workable arrangement, let alone the invention as now claimed, withdrawal of the § 103 rejection based on the teachings of the Muoio and Takahashi references.

As for the rejection of claims 20-23 based upon the teachings of Muoio and Takahashi when viewed in further combination with the Amo et al. publication, it is submitted that nothing in the disclosure of Amo with regard to an elevator display system can make up for the inability of Muoio and Takahashi to render obvious the present invention noted above. Therefore, this rejection should also be withdrawn.

Therefore, in view of the foregoing, in the absence of new and more relevant prior art being found, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance and action to that effect is requested. However, while it is believed that this application should now be in

condition for allowance, in the event that any issues should remain, or an new issues arise, after consideration of this response which could be addressed through discussions with the undersigned, then the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned by telephone for the purpose of resolving any such issue and thereby facilitating approval of this application without further delay.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
David S. Safran
Registration No. 27,997

Roberts Mlotkowski Safran & Cole, P.C.
PO Box 10064
McLean, VA 22102

Direct Telephone: 703-584-3273

DSS:kmm